REMARKS

With this submission, Applicants respectfully request that claims 2-3, 7, 9-10, 20, 23, and 33 be canceled without prejudice. Additionally, claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 12, 22, and 32 are amended herein. Therefore, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-19, 21-22, 24-25, 32, and 34-35 are pending.

REGARDING THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to the claims herein are supported in the Specification as originally submitted. The material added to Applicants' claims is explicitly stated in Applicants' Specification and/or would be understood by one skilled in the art with reference to Applicants' Specification. Consider, for example and not by way of limitation, paragraphs [0022] to [0024] and [0028] to [0033] for support for the claim amendments.

APPLICATION OF THE CITED REFERENCES TO THE CLAIMS

The cited references previously relied on in rejecting the claims as previously presented are U.S. Patent No. 6,519,767 of Carter et al. (hereinafter "Carter") and U.S. Patent No. 6,658,659 of Hiller et al. (hereinafter "Hiller"). Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 6, 22, and 32 are the pending independent claims, and each recite limitations directed to compatibility of software objects shared between two subsystems, and more particularly to software objects stored in one subsystem from which instances are created in another subsystem, where the compatibility of the software objects stored in the one subsystem with the other subsystem is determined. As one example, claim 1 as amended herein recites the following:

> automatically detecting a change introduced into a software object of a
> first software subsystem, **where the first software subsystem stores the**
> **software object from which instances of the software object are created,**
> **wherein the software object is instantiated in a second software subsystem** to
> interact with software objects of the second software subsystem;
> accessing a compatible changes database in response to detecting the
> change, where the compatible changes database indicates changes defined to be
> compatible with the software objects of the second subsystem;
> determining, based on accessing the compatible changes database, whether
> the change is compatible with the software objects of the second software

subsystem, including determining whether the change is predefined as compatible; and

implementing the introduced change to generate an updated software object if the change is compatible with the software objects of the second software subsystem without introducing any changes into the software objects of the second software subsystem; otherwise,

rejecting the introduced change and generating an error notification.

As mentioned above, the remaining independent claims similarly recite limitations directed to identifying a change of a software object of a first software subsystem instantiated in a second software subsystem, and determining compatibility of the change with the second software subsystem.

Applicants acknowledge the change of position with respect to Carter as found in the Examiner's Answer in response to Applicants' Appeal Brief. Namely, the Office changed its application of the reference and conceded Applicants' position that the application servers in Carter are not software objects as claimed. There were also many other arguments discussed in the exchange of the Appeal Brief and Examiner's Answer, which Applicants submit are moot due to the amendments to the claims herein. Applicants' independent claims recite limitations directed to determining whether changes are made to software objects of a first software subsystem that are instantiated in a second software subsystem. As described in detail in Applicants' previous submissions to the Office, Carter discusses the changes of one version of a standalone application as compared with a previous version of the standalone application. There is nothing in Carter that discloses or suggests the changes to software objects of a first software subsystem where objects are stored that are instantiated in a second software subsystem, in contrast to what is recited in Applicants' claims. Hiller, similarly deals with different versions of software, and Applicants do not understand Hiller to disclose or suggest anything related to detecting changes to software objects of a first software subsystem where objects are stored that are instantiated in a second software subsystem.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are patentable over cited references, and rejection of the claims under the references would be improper. The dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth in the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: March 20, 2008

/Vincent H. Anderson/
Vincent H. Anderson
Reg. No. 54,962
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: 3/20/2008   /Katherine Jennings/
                         Katherine Jennings